

Re. Point V:

IAPG Rec'd PCT/PTO 27 MAR 2006

## I. Claim 1:

1. The document EP-A-0 911 662, which is referred to below as D1, describes (see paragraphs [0008] and [0014] to [0018] as well as Figures 1 and 3) an optical module with a rigid circuit carrier (7) which comprises a component-equipped area, a semiconductor component (5) arranged on the component -equipped area and a lens unit (6), which is arranged on the side of the circuit carrier (7) facing away from the component-equipped area, with the circuit carrier (7) featuring an opening, through which electromagnetic radiation is projected from the lens unit (6) onto the semiconductor element (5) and with the lens unit (6) comprising a lens holder (11) and a lens arrangement with at least one lens (12, 13). At least one permanently flexible or springy element (23) is arranged between the lens holder (11) and the circuit carrier (7) which presses the lens holder (11) away from the component-equipped area of the circuit carrier against at least one stop element (16) that is in positive contact with the circuit carrier (7).
2. The object of claim 1 differs from this merely in that the semiconductor element is explicitly not to be packaged and accommodated with flip-chip technology on the circuit carrier, as well as in that instead of the lens holder, the circuit carrier is pressed against stop elements.
3. Both differences only relate to the design of the optical module and for the person skilled in the art are widely-used alternatives to the arrangement claimed in claim 1, which the well-informed person skilled in the art would select depending on the circumstances. In particular the

sensor chip, which is contacted by means of flip-chip technology on a circuit carrier with an opening, is already known from the document DE-A-196 51 60, which is referred to in the following method as D2 (see column 2, lines 24 to 58, and Fig. 1). The decisive feature that the spring lies between the semiconductor element and the lens holder is satisfied by both arrangements. For these reasons claim 1 does not appear to meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.

**II Claims 2 to 11:**

1. The additional feature of claim 2 does not appear to add any new substance to claim 1 since it describes a consequence of the fact that any connection exists between circuit carrier and stop element. Claim 2 does not therefore appear to meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.
2. The additional features of claims 3 and 4 are known to the person skilled in the art e.g. from document EP-A-1 134 601, which is referred to in the following method as D3 (see especially paragraph [0039] to [0041] and Figure 1). Therefore claims 3 and 4 do not appear to fulfill the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.
3. The additional features of claims 5 and 6 fall within the expertise of the average person skilled in the art. Therefore claims 5 and 6 do not appear to fulfill the requirements of Article 33(5) PCT.
4. The additional feature of claim 7 is known from document EP-A-0 286 172, which is referred to in the following method as D4 (see column 3, lines 33 to 37, and Figure 1). Claim 7 does not therefore appear to meet the requirements

of Article 33(3) PCT.

5. The additional features of claims 8 and 9 are neither preëmpted nor approached by the features of the prior art. Therefore claims 8 and 9 appear to meet the requirements of Article 33(2) and (3) PCT.
6. A porous springy element is already known in conjunction with the area of the application from document DE-A-199 34 183, which is referred to in the following method as D5 (see column 1, line 50, to column 2, line 11), so that claim 10 also does not appear to meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.
7. Claim 11 results from conventional use of an optical module. Since the module from claim 1 is evident to the person skilled in the art, this also applies to claim 11 which is dependent on claim 1, which thus does not appear to meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.

**Re. Point VII:**

1. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1 a) ii) PCT, neither the relevant prior art disclosed in document D1 nor this document are specified in the description.

**Re. Point VIII:**

1. It is not clear in claim 6 whether the expression "spacer bolts or screw holes" are to be understood as alternatives, nor is it clear how screw holes alone can be a stop element (Article 6 PCT).